

begging us to take on, we have retreated.

For many issues, we even refuse to allow a simple up-or-down vote on the floor. We are afraid that if we actually allowed a vote, we might actually pass something.

This Congress makes Truman's "do-nothing Congress" seem downright busy. No wonder why our approval numbers are so low. It is ironic that a Congress that refuses to get anything done has the audacity to accuse the President of getting too much done.

The President isn't taking our power away from us. We have abdicated it to him.

Since George Washington, our Presidents have used executive actions to get things done, yet the majority argues that this President is the exception to the rule. President Obama may be the exception, but not in the way that they think. Out of the last 10 Presidents, President Obama has signed the least number of executive orders, on average, per year. So far, the President has even signed half as many as President Reagan did.

Yet despite this, let's remember what the President has been able to accomplish over the last 6 years. President Obama brought our economy back from the brink of depression, lowering unemployment from 10 percent in 2009 to 6.1 percent today. We have had 52 straight months of private sector job growth, with the last month being the fifth month in a row of adding 200,000 jobs or more to the economy.

The President passed health care reform, achieving what every President since Teddy Roosevelt has tried and failed to do. Now millions of Americans who were previously barred from health insurance coverage because of preexisting conditions or because they simply could not afford it can access the care they desperately need.

And the President has taken unprecedented action to protect our environment. He has proposed the toughest fuel economy standards for passenger vehicles in U.S. history, put a plan in place to cut carbon pollution from new and existing power plants, and significantly increased production of renewable energy.

In 6 years, President Obama has accomplished more than many who have come before him, despite a do-nothing Congress whose stated mission has been obstruction.

Mr. Speaker, Malcolm X used to say that if you have no critics, you likely have no successes.

The intent of the majority's lawsuit may be to spotlight the President's critics, but I am confident that what it will actually do is prove his successes.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act reforms our broken and harmful mental health system. Here are some reasons why we need it.

For some who are experiencing the most serious mental illnesses, like bipolar disorder or schizophrenia, they don't think their hallucinations are real; they know they are real. Their illness affects their brains in such a way that they are certain, beyond all doubt, their delusions are real. It is not an attitude or denial. It is a very real brain condition.

With that understanding, we are left with a series of questions: Do these individuals have a right to be sick, or do they have a right to treatment? Do they have a right to live as victims on the streets, or do they have a right to get better? Do they have a right to be disabled and unemployed, or do they have a right to recover and get back to work? I believe these individuals and their families have the right to heal and lead healthy lives.

But they are sometimes blinded by a symptom called anosognosia, a neurological condition of the frontal lobe which renders the individual incapable of understanding that they are ill.

Every single day, millions of families struggle to help a loved one with serious mental illness who won't seek treatment. Many knew that Aaron Alexis, James Holmes, Jared Loughner, Adam Lanza, and Elliot Rodgers needed help.

Their families tried, but the individual's illness caused them to believe nothing was wrong, and they fought against the help. These families watch their brother, their son, or their parent spiral downward in a system that, by design, only responds after crisis, not before or during. The loved one is more likely to end up in prison or living on the streets, where they suffer violence and victimization, or cycle in and out of the emergency room or commit suicide.

In a recent New York Times article about Rikers Island prison, they report that over an 11-month period last year, 129 inmates suffered injuries so serious that doctors at the jail's clinics were unable to treat them; 77 percent of those inmates had been previously diagnosed with mental illness.

Rikers now has as many people with mental illness as all 24 psychiatric hospitals in New York State combined, and they make up nearly 40 percent of the jail population, up from about 20 percent 8 years ago.

Inmates with mental illnesses commit two-thirds of the infractions in the jail, and they commit an overwhelming majority of assaults on jail staff members. Yet, by law, they cannot be medicated involuntarily at the jail, and hospitals often refuse to accept them unless they harm themselves or others.

Is that humane? Shouldn't we have acted before they committed a crime to compel them to get help?

According to the article, correctional facilities now hold 95 percent of all in-

stitutionalized people with mental illness. That is wrong. Yet with all we know about mental illness and the treatments to help those experiencing it, there are still organizations, federally funded with taxpayer dollars, that believe individuals who are too sick to seek treatment will be better off left alone than in inpatient or outpatient treatment. It is insensitive. It is callous. It is misguided. It is unethical. It is immoral. And Congress should not stand by as these organizations continue their abusive malpractice against the mentally ill.

The misguided ones are more comfortable allowing the mentally ill to live under bridges or behind dumpsters than getting the emergency help that they need in a psychiatric hospital or an outpatient clinic because they cling to their fears of the old asylums, as if medical science and the understanding of the brain has not advanced over the last 60 years.

We would never deny treatment to a stroke victim or a senior with Alzheimer's disease simply because he or she is unable to ask for care. Yet, in cases of serious brain disorders, like schizophrenia, this cruel conundrum prevents us from acting even when we know we must because the laws say we can't. We must change those misguided and harmful laws.

The system is the most difficult for those who have the greatest difficulty. Why are some more comfortable with prison or homelessness or unemployment, poverty, and a 25-year shorter life span?

I tell my colleagues: Do not turn a blind eye to those that need our help. The mentally ill can and will get better if Congress takes the right action.

Tomorrow, Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and I will hold a briefing at 3 p.m. on the rights of the seriously mentally ill to get treatment. I hope my colleagues will attend and understand that we have to take mental illness out of the shadows by passing the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 3717, because where there is no help, there is no hope.

HONORING TED RUBIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to honor the military service and the life of Tibor—known to us as Ted—Rubin, a Korean war veteran, a Holocaust survivor, and a prisoner of war survivor.

Mr. Rubin received the Congressional Medal of Honor in 2005, and he will be the guest of honor at a ceremony in the city of Garden Grove at their post office in Orange County, California, on August 8, 2014.

Ted was born on June 18, 1929, in Hungary. He spent 14 months in a concentration camp in Austria, which was

liberated by the United States Army. Inspired by the work of the United States Army who saved him, he enlisted and became a member of the U.S. Army's 8th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Cavalry Division, on February 13, 1950, and he was soon deployed to Korea.

Despite facing religious discrimination from his sergeant, who sent him on the most dangerous missions in South Korea's Pusan Perimeter and who withheld his commendation, he fought valiantly. Corporal Rubin enabled the complete withdrawal of his comrades by solely defending a hill under an overwhelming assault by North Korean troops.

He inflicted a staggering number of casualties on the attacking force during his personal 24-hour battle and helped capture several hundred North Korean soldiers. During a massive nighttime assault, he manned a .30-caliber machine gun and slowed the pace of the enemy advance.

On a later assignment, Corporal Rubin was severely wounded, and he was captured. He disregarded his own personal safety and immediately began sneaking out of the camp at night in search of food for his comrades.

Risking certain torture or death if he was caught, he provided food to the starving soldiers, and he provided desperately needed medical care for the wounded in the prisoner of war camp. He used improvised medical techniques to save his fellow soldiers and provided critical moral support. His brave, selfless efforts were directly attributed to saving the lives of as many as 40 of his fellow prisoners.

Corporal Rubin's gallant actions in close contact with the enemy and unyielding courage and bravery while a prisoner of war are in the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself and the United States Army.

Corporal Rubin states: "I always wanted to become a citizen of the United States, and when I became a citizen, it was one of the happiest days in my life. I think about the United States, and I am a lucky person to live here. When I came to America, it was the first time I was free. It was one of the reasons I joined the U.S. Army, because I wanted to show my appreciation. It is the best country in the world, and I am part of it now. I do not have to worry about the gestapo knocking on my door tonight. I have shalom, peace. People die for it."

HAS LAST CHRISTIAN LEFT IRAQI CITY OF MOSUL AFTER 2,000 YEARS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to read the following piece that was posted on nbcnews.com yesterday. The headline was: "Has Last Christian Left Iraqi City of Mosul After 2,000 Years?"

Samer Kamil Yacub was alone when four Islamist militants carrying AK-47s arrived

at his front door and ordered him to leave the city. The 70-year-old Christian had failed to comply with a decree issued by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, ISIS.

Yacub's hometown of Mosul had boasted a Christian community for almost 2,000 years. But then the al Qaeda-inspired fighters who overran the city last month gave Christians an ultimatum. They could stay and pay a tax or convert to Islam—or be killed.

Yacub, 70, was one of the few Christians remaining beyond last Saturday's noon deadline. He may have even been the last to leave alive. "A fighter said, 'I have orders to kill you now,'" Yacub said just hours after the Sunni extremists tried to force their way into his home at 11 a.m. on Monday. "All of the people in my neighborhood were Muslim. They came to help me—about 20 people—at the door in front of my house. They tried to convince ISIS not to kill me."

The rebels spared Yacub but threw him out of the city where he had spent his entire life. They also took his Iraqi ID card before informing him that elderly women would be given his house.

Mr. Speaker, this is but one example of what is unfolding in Iraq right before our eyes. The end of Christianity, as we now know it, is taking place in Iraq. This is the fifth time I have come to the floor over the last week to try to raise awareness of what is happening, to talk about the genocide.

It is genocide that is taking place. Yes, genocide: the systematic extermination of a people of faith by violent extremists seizing power in a region. Churches and monasteries have been seized. Many of them have been burned down.

Last week, it was widely reported that ISIS had blown up the tomb of the prophet Jonah.

Christians, threatened with their lives if they do not leave the region, are being robbed as they leave a land they have lived on for more than 2,000 years.

With the exception of Israel, the Bible contains more references to the cities, regions, and nations of ancient Iraq than any other country. The patriarch Abraham lived in the city of Ur. Isaac's bride, Rebekah, came from northwest Iraq. Jacob spent 20 years in Iraq, and his sons—the 12 tribes of Israel—were born in northwest Iraq. The events of the book of Esther took place in Iraq, as did the account of Daniel in the lion's den.

Many of Iraq's Christians still speak Aramaic, the language of Jesus. The Pope has spoken out. His Beatitude Ignatius Ephrem Joseph III Younan, the overseer of Syriac Catholics around the globe, has spoken out.

□ 1030

His Grace Bishop Angaelos, general bishop of the Coptic Orthodox Church in the United Kingdom, has spoken out. Archbishop Justin Welby, the archbishop of Canterbury and leader of the world's 80 million Anglicans, has spoken out. Russell Moore, a key leader in the Southern Baptist Convention, has spoken out.

Despite these Christian leaders speaking out about the systematic ex-

termination of Christians in Iraq, the silence in this town, in Washington, is deafening. Does Washington even care? Where is the Obama administration? The President has failed. Where is the Congress? The Congress has failed.

Time is running out. The Christians and other religious minorities in Iraq are being targeted for extinction. They need our help. Literally, during our time, we will see the end of Christianity in the place it began.

INSTITUTIONAL LITIGATION IS UNPRECEDENTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I spent 30 years in a courtroom, one-half of those as a judge, including 2 years on the North Carolina Supreme Court. I have taken particular interest in House Resolution 676, and I have spent considerable time researching the standing of the House to initiate litigation against a President or Department heads or Federal agencies to seek "appropriate relief for failure to act in a manner consistent with the duties of the executive branch."

Never before, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the Congress, has there been "institutional litigation" between two coequal branches of government—never. There have been prior cases involving individual Members of Congress who have alleged that their vote had been nullified by Presidential action, but none of them succeeded.

This bill will clearly authorize institutional litigation between the legislative and executive branches—unprecedented, Mr. Speaker.

The Republicans have chosen to proceed with a one-Chamber resolution. The Affordable Care Act, I remind you, was a two-Chamber enactment. The House, as an institution, as a subset of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, cannot by itself enforce a legislative enactment. It must be bicameral.

This misguided and politically-motivated resolution will establish a precedent that is unknown in our jurisprudence. It is an abuse of power on the part of House Republicans.

If this bill passes and this Republican-controlled House initiates a lawsuit without Senate authorization, it will threaten the separation of powers principle and the checks and balances that we have long cherished in our country.

I ask my colleagues: Do you want the judiciary to become the arbiter of disputes between the Congress and the President? Do you really want to cede to the courts the authority to resolve disputes between the branches?

If you set this precedent, then, in the future, the House or the Senate, acting alone, could simply allege a constitutional violation against the President and get its day in court.